

R E M A R K S

Claims 9-12 are pending in this application. No claims have been canceled, added or amended. Applicants submit the following remarks in support of the patentability of the claims.

Restriction Requirement

Applicants continue to traverse the restriction requirement. Applicants continue to submit that the subject matter of claims 9 and 10 is sufficiently connected to claims 11 and 12 and no undue burden is placed on the Examiner to exam-all the claims in unison. As such, Applicants request that claims 9-12 be rejoined and examined in unison.

Rejection under 35 USC §102(b) or §103(a)

The Examiner rejects claim 9 as anticipated by or obvious over WO 95/15995 (WO '995), Takemoto et al. USP 4,530,972 (Takemoto '972) or Albano et al. USP 5,948,868 (Albano '868). Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

Applicants incorporate by reference the arguments and remarks submitted in the Reply filed on June 20, 2002 regarding the teachings in WO '995, Takemoto '972 and Albano '686. None of the cited references discloses or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. WO '995 , Takemoto '972 and Albano '686 each fail to disclose or suggest a primary and secondary curing step at the specific conditions of the claimed invention.

The cited references exemplify the peroxides used in the present invention and other peroxides, such as 2,5-dimethyl-2,5-di(tert-butylperoxy)hexane (Perhexa 2,5B) as equal. Yet, the cited references fail to distinguish the peroxides used in the present invention from other peroxides. Perhexa 2,5B is the peroxide used in all of the working examples.

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify one of the cited references to do a secondary curing of a specific peroxide of the present invention. Moreover, there is no disclosure that the cured products of the cited references have the same properties as the cured products of the present invention, which have undergone primary and secondary curing under the specifically recited conditions. Since not all elements of the present invention are disclosed or suggested, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejects claim 10 as obvious over Takemoto '972. Applicants traverse the rejection relying on the arguments above regarding the deficiencies in Takemoto '972. For the same reasons as stated above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejects claim 10 as obvious over WO '995, Takemoto '972 or Albano '686 in view of admissions by Applicants. Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

Applicants rely on the arguments above regarding the deficiencies in WO '995, Takemoto '972 and Albano '686. Applicants' admission cited by the Examiner does not compensate for the deficiencies in the cited references so that one of ordinary skill could arrive at the present invention by making the modifications consistent with Applicants alleged admission. For the same reasons as stated above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

As Applicants have addressed and overcome all rejections in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Kecia Reynolds (Reg. No. 47,021) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Andrew D. Meikle, #32,868


ADM/KJR:bmp
0020-4621P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000